

### REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for his clearly stated action.

This communication is being filed in response to the Office Action having a mailing date of October 30, 2007, in which a three (3) month Shortened Statutory Period for Response has been set, due to expire January 30, 2008. Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, and 17 are currently amended. Claims 25-30 are canceled. New claim 31 is added. Claims 3-8, 11-19, and 31 are pending.

#### I. Objections to Claim 29

Claim 29 has been objected to for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 29 has been canceled, and it is respectfully requested that the objection now be withdrawn.

#### II. Acknowledgement of Allowed Claims and Allowable Subject Matter

Pages 21-22 of the Office Action indicated that if claims 4 and 12 were dissected into two constituent parts, and if one of the constituent parts were incorporated into the respective base claim, then the base claim would contain allowable subject matter. The Office Action also indicated that similar arguments may apply equally for claim independent 17.

Accordingly, the Examiner is asked to recognize that the suggested limitation of “when the content of the extended addressing register is equal to 0, saving all the registers of the central processing unit containing contextual data, except for the extended addressing register” has been removed from dependent claim 4 and has been added, nearly verbatim, into independent claim 3. The only modifications were to clarify that the central processing unit is arranged for saving according to the recited limitation and to change the specific “0” to “a first value.” In light of these modifications, the remaining element in dependent claim 4 has been changed to reflect that the central processing unit is arranged for saving a different number of registers when the extended addressing register is not equal to “the first value.”

Similar amendments have been made to independent claim 11 and dependent claim 12. Particularly, the step of “when the content of the extended addressing register is equal to 0, saving all the registers of the central processing unit containing contextual data, except for the extended addressing register” has been removed from dependent claim 12, and added to independent claim 11. The specific “0” has also been modified to recite a “first value” in both independent claim 11 and dependent claim 12.

Additionally, and along the lines of the amendments made to independent claims 3 and 11, independent claim 17 has been amended to recite “the central processing unit is arranged for, when the content of the flag is equal to the first value, saving all the registers of the central processing unit containing contextual data, except for an extended addressing register.” Also, the limitation of “the flag is asserted to the second value when the extended portion of the program counter has a portion of an extended address” has moved into new dependent claim 31. Thus, for at least the reason that claims 3, 4, 11, 12, and 17 have been amended along the lines suggested by the Office Action, claims 3-8, 11-19, and 31 are in condition for allowance.

### III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

At sections 3 through 26 of the Office Action (pages 2-20), claims 3-9, 11-19, and 25-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Padmanabhan et al.*, (U.S. Patent Application 2004/0221141), hereinafter *Padmanabhan*, in view of *Christie et al.*, (WO 02/13005), hereinafter *Christie*, and in further view of *Pilat et al.*, (U.S. Patent 4,448,173), hereinafter *Pilat*.

In light of the amendments made to claims 3, 4, 11, 12, and 17, the rejections to claims 3-9 and 11-19 are rendered moot and should be withdrawn. Further, in order to move the application toward allowance, claims 25-30 have been canceled.

### IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 3, 11, and 17 are allowable. Dependent claims 4-8 depend from claim 3, dependent claims 12-16 depend from claim 11, and dependent claims 18-19 and 31 depend from claim 17. These

dependent claims recite additional limitations not contained in their respective parent claims, and are therefore believed allowable as further defining over the applied references. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

This amendment is made in order to reach agreement on the present claims and have the case advanced to allowance. If a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to the allowability of the claims has been overlooked, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such teaching may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Mr. Iannucci at (206) 622-4900.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment only, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,  
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/Robert Iannucci/  
Robert Iannucci  
Registration No. 33,514

RXI:TJS:jrh

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Phone: (206) 622-4900  
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1102787\_1.DOC